

PUBLIC COPY



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

identifying data deleted to
prevent unauthorized
invasion of personal privacy

JAN 27 2004

FILE: WAC 02 279 52284 Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:


IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is a medical research facility that seeks to employ the beneficiary as a database manager. The petitioner, therefore, endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 (a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition because the beneficiary is not qualified to perform the duties of a specialty occupation. On appeal, counsel submits a brief and a credentials evaluation for the beneficiary.

Section 214(i)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(2), states that an alien applying for classification as an H-1B nonimmigrant worker must possess full state licensure to practice in the occupation, if such licensure is required to practice in the occupation, and completion of the degree in the specialty that the occupation requires. If the alien does not possess the required degree, the petitioner must demonstrate that the alien has experience in the specialty equivalent to the completion of such degree, and recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions relating to the specialty.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C), to qualify to perform services in a specialty occupation, an alien must meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) Hold a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (2) Hold a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree required by the specialty occupation from an accredited college or university;
- (3) Hold an unrestricted state license, registration or certification which authorizes him or her to fully practice the specialty occupation and be immediately engaged in that specialty in the state of intended employment; or
- (4) Have education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation, and have recognition of expertise in the specialty through progressively responsible positions directly related to the specialty.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains, in part: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as a database manager. The petitioner indicated in an August 15, 2002 letter that it wished to hire the beneficiary because her educational experience and employment history make up for her lack of a baccalaureate degree. The petitioner stated that it requires a baccalaureate degree or its equivalent and database skills for the proffered position. There is no reference to a requirement that the degree be in a specialty related to the proffered position.

The director found that the beneficiary was not qualified for the proffered position because the beneficiary's education, experience, and training were not equivalent to a baccalaureate degree in a specialty required by the occupation. The petitioner submitted a credentials evaluation with the petition which stated that the beneficiary's foreign degree:

[I]s equivalent to three years toward a bachelor's degree in Accounting offered by an accredited university in the United States. . . . [The beneficiary's additional education] is equivalent to at least 16 graduate credits in a computer-related discipline from an accredited university in the United States. It may yield some undergraduate credits in a computer-related discipline, to be determined through a course-by-course analysis by a qualified faculty member.

The director requested additional evidence, specifically that the petitioner submit "evidence that the beneficiary has education, specialized training, and/or progressively responsible experience that is equivalent to completion of a United States baccalaureate or higher degree in the specialty occupation." In response, counsel reiterated the information previously submitted, and stated, "I hope that my bringing this to your attention provides you with all that is necessary to approve the petition." On appeal, counsel states that the response to the request for evidence was never meant to be an actual response, but rather that it was "an inquiry as to what specific documentation the reviewing officer preferred." Counsel submits a statement regarding his conversation with a supervisor at the Premium Processing Unit immediately following receipt of the director's decision, in which he stated that the fax was not meant to be a response to the director's request for information. Counsel submits substantial documentation regarding the beneficiary's qualifications with the appeal. Counsel's language in the fax response to the director's request for evidence is unequivocal. On appeal, he asserts that it was not meant as a response; however, the AAO notes that there is no inquiry in the fax, but rather a response that clearly states that with the information provided, he hoped the director would be able to approve the petition.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) regulations affirmatively require a petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefit it is seeking at the time the petition is filed. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(12). The purpose of a Request for Evidence (RFE) is to elicit further information that clarifies whether eligibility for the benefit sought has been established. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(8).

The petitioner was put on notice of required evidence and given a reasonable opportunity to provide it for the record before the visa petition was adjudicated. The petitioner provided a statement that appears to be a final and conclusive response. The petitioner failed to submit the requested evidence and now submits it on appeal. However, the Administrative Appeals Office will not consider this evidence for any purpose. *Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988). The appeal will be adjudicated based on the record of proceeding before the director.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform an occupation that would require a baccalaureate degree in a computer-related field. The beneficiary does not hold a baccalaureate degree from an accredited U.S. college or university in any field of study, or a foreign degree determined to be equivalent to a baccalaureate degree from a U.S. college or university in any field of study. Therefore, the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary meets the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(C)(4).

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D), equating the beneficiary's credentials to a United States baccalaureate or higher degree shall be determined by one or more of the following:

- (1) An evaluation from an official who has authority to grant college-level credit for training and/or experience in the specialty at an accredited college or university which has a program for granting such credit based on an individual's training and/or work experience;
- (2) The results of recognized college-level equivalency examinations or special credit programs, such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or Program on Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction (PONS);
- (3) An evaluation of education by a reliable credentials evaluation service which specializes in evaluating foreign educational credentials; or
- (4) Evidence of certification or registration from a nationally-recognized professional association or society for the specialty that is known to grant certification or registration to persons in the occupational specialty who have achieved a certain level of competence in the specialty;
- (5) A determination by the Service that the equivalent of the degree required by the specialty occupation has been acquired through a combination of education, specialized training, and/or work experience in areas related to the specialty and that the alien has achieved recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation as a result of such training and experience.

None of this evidence exists in the record prior to the appeal. The AAO notes that it was submitted with the appeal, but as previously discussed, it will not be considered. The director made his decision based on the evaluation from The Knowledge Company, which was submitted with the petition. The Knowledge Company specializes in evaluating academic credentials. The evaluator concluded that the beneficiary possesses the equivalent of three years towards a bachelor's degree in accounting from an accredited U.S. college or university.

When CIS determines an alien's qualifications pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(D)(5), three years of specialized training and/or work experience must be demonstrated for each year of college-level training the alien lacks. It must be clearly demonstrated that the alien's training and/or work experience included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty occupation; that the alien's experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation; and that the alien has recognition of expertise in the specialty evidenced by at least one type of documentation such as:

- (i) Recognition of expertise in the specialty occupation by at least two recognized authorities in the same specialty occupation¹;

¹ *Recognized authority* means a person or organization with expertise in a particular field, special skills or knowledge in that field, and the expertise to render the type of opinion requested. A recognized authority's opinion must state: (1) the writer's qualifications as an expert; (2) the writer's experience giving such opinions, citing specific instances where past opinions have been accepted as authoritative and by whom; (3) how the conclusions were reached; and (4) the basis for the conclusions supported by copies or citations of any research material used. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii).

- (ii) Membership in a recognized foreign or United States association or society in the specialty occupation;
- (iii) Published material by or about the alien in professional publications, trade journals, books, or major newspapers;
- (iv) Licensure or registration to practice the specialty occupation in a foreign country; or
- (v) Achievements which a recognized authority has determined to be significant contributions to the field of the specialty occupation.

The documentation does not establish equivalence to a baccalaureate degree in any computer-related field. The petitioner did not submit any independent evidence to illustrate how the beneficiary's computer training relates to the completion of a baccalaureate degree in a computer-related field. *See Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972).

The AAO now turns to the beneficiary's prior work experience, and whether it included the theoretical and practical application of specialized knowledge required by the specialty. The petitioner submitted letters from two employers that indicate that the beneficiary developed and maintained databases and administered a network. It is not clear whether the beneficiary's duties involved the theoretical and practical application of database management and, therefore, the AAO cannot conclude that the beneficiary's past work experience included the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge. Furthermore, neither employer indicates that the beneficiary's work experience was gained while working with peers, supervisors, or subordinates who have a degree or its equivalent in the specialty occupation, nor did the letter writers meet the definition of a recognized authority.

Finally, there is insufficient evidence that the beneficiary has recognition of expertise. No information was provided beyond the letters of the beneficiary's previous employers.

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified to perform the duties of the proffered position. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.